DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 766 08 AC 012 880

AUTHOR	Miller, Norma; And Others
TITLE	Guide Lines for Evaluation of Continuing Education Programs in Mental Health.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. of Mental Health, Rockville, Md.
REPORT NO	DHEW-HSM-72-9014
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	17p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 1724-0167, $.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Charts; *Evaluation; *Mental Health Programs; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Suggestions for program administrators and training program directors to develop comprehensive plans based on principles of community involvement, education, administration and finance, and the disciplines being taught are broadly outlined. Three accompanying charts illustrate approach to evaluation planning. (NF)

ED 068766

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

guide

for evaluation of continuing education programs in mental health

national clearinghouse for mental health information • national institute of mental health

AC012880

introduction

Directors of continuing education programs often express concern about evaluating the impact of their programs. Funding agencies, program participants, and other interested persons share this concern. In settings where research experts are available to participate in evaluation, the types of methods used and knowledge gained, such as questionnaires for measurement of attitude change, sometimes have little direct utilization in changing the program. Research experts share the concern for effective useful program evaluation.

One problem related to evaluation is that training program directors and faculty often do not gather the kinds of information which could make them aware of new possibilities for improving their programs. They are sometimes unaware of information that could be fairly easily obtained and that could have a considerable impact on their programs. It has also been noted that a constant frustration for program directors is the great limitation of time available for administration, including program planning and evaluation.

These Guidelines have been written with the hope that they will be useful to training program directors and to research persons who consult and participate in program evaluation. The Guidelines can be an aid to such persons as they explore the range of information useful for planning, designing and evaluating their programs.

The emphasis of these Guidelines is on the types of information that provide a basis for program administrators to make constructive changes in their programs. Evaluation data not only includes information more customarily thought of in relation to assessment of educational methods and outcome, but information essential for program planning as well.

In order to develop the Guidelines an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Continuing Education Program Evaluation was convened in April, 1969, sponsored by the Continuing Education Branch, Division of Manpower and Training Programs, National Institute of Mental Health. Fifteen experts representing a variety of disciplines from universities, training organizations, and government agencies in addition to ten NIMH staff members met and discussed the many facets of evaluation.

The Guidelines are necessarily broad and designed so that training program directors may select and use the items which are most relevant to their programs. The Guidelines are not designed as a program planning guide, except for the evaluation aspects of the program. However, the principles discussed may be helpful in developing more comprehensive plans based on principles of (1) community involvement, (2) education, (3) administration and finance, and (4) the disciplines(s) being taught.

It is anticipated that this initial edition of the Guidelines will later be revised on the basis of feedback from persons who have used them. Suggestions as to which portions should be retained, deleted, modified, illustrated or supplemented will be most welcome.

what is educational evaluation

Evaluation and Program Objectives

Well defined program objectives are crucial for purposes of program evaluation. The objectives may be defined in terms of criteria of mental health for the community or population being served, in terms of changes in the learners or their organizations, in terms of secondary phenomena which the educational program is expected to induce via the learners, in terms of increments in demonstrable knowledge and skills or in terms of demonstrable effectiveness or the relative merits of one educational method compared to another.

Determination of objectives is a technical process in itself, and much has been written on this subject in literature on administration, research and education. For any continuing education program the objectives should be determined for a variety of levels, not all of which are necessarily incorporated into formal evaluation of outcome.

1. General institutional objectives.
2. Educational program objectives.
3. Educational activity objectives.

First, the sponsoring institution(s) should have a representative advisory committee which includes administrators, faculty, participant trainees and consumers of services. *General institutional objectives* should be clarified in terms of the uniqueness of the sponsoring organization(s) and their mission(s), in terms of the available manpower and in terms of the ultimate population being served. This may require considerable discussion and clarification based upon available data as well as philosophy and values. Since every organization has limitations in resources for accomplishing its purposes, the objectives should be translated into priorities and strategies to assure that the limited resources are employed in a feasible manner for maximal impact on high priority needs. Such a strategy naturally includes concepts of long range development as well as immediate impact, concepts of learning and change in individuals and organizational teams, concepts of spread effect and secondary impact via key catalysts within the system and concepts for initiating self-perpetuating processes based upon the motivation of persons in the system rather than leaving the program overly dependent upon the motivation of the initial planners and administrators.

Within this context and consistent with these general objectives, the *educational program objectives* should be determined in terms of what types of changes in knowledge, skills and behavior are expected in what types of personnel. The participants in the continuing education program are thus selected on the basis of their priority significance for accomplishing the general objectives of the sponsoring organization(s).

Within this context more specific *educational activity objectives* can be determined for any specific course or other educational activity. Educational objectives are preferably defined in terms of measurable behavioral change, which can thus provide a basis for evaluation of results. Educational methods are preferably selected only after the educational objectives have been determined, and the methods should be consistent with the objectives. For example, changes in skill are not usually obtained by lecture methods. Evaluation of methods is usually intermediate or secondary to evaluation of educational outcome or achievement of educational objectives. By the same token, evaluation of a specific course is secondary to the achievement of overall program objectives.

Regardless of which aspects of a total program are selected for the most intensive evaluation, there should be an internal consistency in different levels of objectives and methods, and some type of evaluation is necessary at all levels.

In summary, the most useful evaluation is closely associated with "keeping your eye on the ball" rather than being caught up in intermediate or esoteric facets of the program. Clearly defined objectives and related evaluation of continuing education programs also enable the funding agency and other sponsoring organizations to attain their objectives, which in turn contributes to the improvement of high priority mental health services at all levels.

Educational Evaluation—A Circular Process

For the purpose of these guidelines, educational evaluation is defined as the process by which relevant information is constantly gathered and fed back into the program *to be used as the basis for enlightened decision making* leading to improvements in the program.

Evaluation has an important function in well-planned continuing education programs from their earliest inception, such as helping to determine the continuing education needs in a community.

Evaluation is essential in each of the following stages of program development:

1. Assessing the mental health problems of the community and the specific needs they reflect for continuing education. Depending upon the nature of the sponsoring organization, the "community" may be local, State, regional or national.
2. Defining the educational objectives in specific behavioral terms.
3. Defining the target audience for the program, and developing methods for selection of the desired trainees.
4. Determining the educational content and methods to be used.
5. Developing plans for gathering evaluation data and feeding relevant results back into the program to accomplish constructive change.

Educational evaluation for continuing education is thus conceived as a continuous, circular process. The cumulative evaluation at the end of one year of a program should provide a basis for the planning and evaluation process during the second year. This continuous, circular process helps integrate evaluation into program planning and implementation. Assessment of the outcome and effectiveness of a specific educational activity or program for a particular year is only one phase in the total evaluation process.

Educational Evaluation and Educational Research

Evaluation and research have many similarities. In a broad sense research includes evaluation, and evaluation may use research procedures and fact finding methods. However, educational evaluation and educational research differ in several significant dimensions.

The purpose of research is to discover and verify principles and to develop new knowledge, which may or may not be immediately applied. The purpose of evaluation is to provide information for enlightened decision making and application to improve the ongoing program.

Elaborate methods are generally devised to make it possible for scientific investigators to divorce themselves as much as possible from value judgments. Findings in specific basic research projects are not ordinarily fed back into the project to accomplish immediate change. Rather, the program is kept constant for the period of the research so that one or more elements of induced, controlled change can be precisely measured.

Research principles and methods are often used in evaluation. However, the capacity of a continuing education program to apply highly sophisticated educational research methods in their program evaluation will depend upon the resources available. Most continuing education programs have neither the need nor the capacity to utilize highly technical research methods, let alone perform basic research.

Educational program administrators view both the methods and the purpose of evaluation from a wide variety of perspectives. These range from views that equate evaluation with formal research procedures to very informal views of evaluation that are more akin to the opinions, judgments and intuition of administrators.

Naturally, in a long range perspective research program development operates by much the same principles as educational or service program development. Basic principles of program evaluation and program development apply to all. The above distinctions between research and evaluation are valid in the context of these Guidelines and are too often overlooked in program evaluation. However, this discussion is not intended to overlook the importance of value judgments, application of findings and program development in research work. By the same token, an educational program will at times hold certain variables constant and keep value judgments to a minimum in the interests of evaluation.

Other Dimensions of Evaluation

Evaluation may be regarded in several dimensions, such as (1) ultimate vs immediate vs intermediate outcome (2) broad vs focused impact (3) long range vs short term (4) process vs outcome and (5) cost effectiveness vs educational effectiveness.

In terms of *ultimate objectives* each program can be judged for its contribution in the effort to solve mental health problems. In terms of *intermediate objectives* a program may be evaluated for its effect on the functioning of the learners. How did the educational program

change them, and how will this in turn affect mental health in their communities? In terms of *immediate objectives* a program may be evaluated for the effectiveness of the educational methods in fostering learning and behavioral change in the learners.

Assessment of ultimate objectives, that is changes in the population served by the trainees, is highly desirable but can be difficult and expensive. When expert resources are available for such things as epidemiologic studies these may provide a means for assessing the effectiveness of the continuing education program in terms of improved indices of mental health. Such evaluation would usually be accomplished by integrating the educational program within existing programs for planning and delivery of services, as compared to supporting such evaluation as part of the educational program.

Another dimension of evaluation is the difficulty assessing *broadly dispersed ripple effects* as compared to *focused impact* of the educational program.

Often educational program administrators would see the ultimate outcome on the mental health of a population as too broad and indefinite for assessment compared to their focus on the intermediate outcome of changes in trainees or immediate satisfaction with teaching methods. However, ultimate vs intermediate objectives need not be synonymous with breadth vs fine focus. Selection of a limited specific criterion of change in a limited specific population can make the assessment of both ultimate and intermediate impact an easier task. For example, a measurable ultimate objective might be the reduction in rate of arrests for alcoholism in a population of 200,000. In this context the design and evaluation of impact of a continuing education program (impact on both trainees and the population at risk) could be more focused and feasible than assessing the impact on 200 participants of a weekend symposium on alcoholism, let alone assessing the impact on their clients. Naturally, not all continuing education programs can or should provide such a fine focus on the ultimate objectives. However, problems of educational evaluation are compounded by the tendency for educators to focus on immediate and intermediate objectives—or on "satisfaction" rather than any more specific educational objective.

Evaluation of long range objectives, such as a five year program, is obviously a different task than *evaluation of short term objectives*, such as the effects of a specific course. Program development may remain static or deteriorate if evaluation is concentrated only on short term objectives. Not infrequently a "successful" continuing education project in the first two years can flounder on "recruitment problems" by the fifth year.

Evaluation of educational methods and process cannot remain divorced from educational outcome. A continuing education program may rely so heavily on a process of demonstrated value, such as supervised clinical work or small group methods, that the program becomes characterized by "riding a hobby horse". Ultimate and intermediate objectives may be lost from view, only a special self-selected group of trainees may be reached, and the satisfaction of faculty and trainees with the process may obscure an abortion in program development. On the other hand, evaluation of outcome in terms of ultimate and intermediate objectives may be an empty exercise if the educational process and methods are demonstrably unsatisfactory. "Happiness data" is not a substitute for assessment of outcome, but student satisfaction is obviously an important ingredient for the educational process. In a related dimension, evaluation of methods and outcome should include assessment of *efficiency* as well as *effectiveness* of the methods and process.

The director of an educational program cannot be oblivious of *cost effectiveness*, no matter how convincing the evidence of *educational effectiveness*. Generally speaking, the more costly the education per trainee-hour (or per unit of assessed outcome) the greater the need to demonstrate the spread effect or ultimate impact of the program. High cost may conceivably be justified by virtue of assured secondary influences or activities of the key persons being trained or by virtue of initiating a self-sustaining process that requires relatively small cost for the ultimate outcome. Cost effectiveness thus becomes related to motivation of trainees and their employers, their willingness to contribute to financial support of the educational program and their potential for accomplishing the ultimate objectives of the program. Assessment of cost effectiveness is important to program planners to assure optimal utilization of limited resources. It is also important for attracting further support from trustees and other funding resources.

Evaluation and Vested Interests

Any continuing education program can and probably will be evaluated from a variety of points of view. A well-constructed evaluation plan will make provisions for obtaining feedback from as many of the following as possible:

1. **The Community:** How does the program help the total community? Does it fit into the community health priorities picture? Does it fit into the community organization and leadership situation? Have the trainees been selected on the basis of their strategic impact for the community? How well does the program fit with activities of related and/or conflicting interest groups? What changes have occurred in the community and the target population as a result of the continuing education program?
2. **The Trainees:** Do the overall training goals and objectives of the program meet the needs of the target population? How valuable was the training experience to the trainee group? Did the program contribute any fringe benefits such as career advancement, academic credit, enhancement of role?
3. **The Sponsoring Organization:** How well does the program fit into the structure and tribute to the identity of the training institution? How does it contribute to the aims and services provided by the institution? Does the program involve organizational changes which would enhance the institution's capacity for achieving its objectives?
4. **The Program Director and Staff:** How do they see their roles in the project? Are their activities viewed as professionally helpful and appropriate? How do their activities affect their careers? Do their roles carry high or low status?
5. **The Funding Organization:** Does the application reflect a carefully planned program based on need? Is the program feasible? Is the program strategic in its impact for purposes of accomplishing the objectives of the funding organization? Are potential participants involved in program planning? Do plans call fo efficient administration and financial effectiveness? Is the program integrated into other community efforts relating to the same problem? Are educational objectives identified? Are provisions made for effective instruction? Is the subject matter relevant and adequate in quality as well as quantity? Does the program design incorporate evaluation based on the objectives of the planned training program? Are the accomplishments consistent with the priorities of the funding organization? Are the administrative policies and procedures consistent with those of the funding organization? Will the program assessment provide data appropriate for progress reports and/or final reports?

With the possible exception o' the sponsoring institution, the funding agency, the training director, and the trainees, very few individuals in the opinion-forming groups described in the previous section will be asked to make formal judgments about a continu g education program which comes to their attention. Even fewer will engage in scientific measurements, but all will have ideas about the program's values and weaknesses.

By being aware of these vested interests and by involving representatives of these groups in both planning and evaluation, a program director may attract more resources and build a stronger program.

Representatives of such groups will use various sets of principles or criteria in making their judgments, depending upon their backgrounds.

Example: An administrator will use principles of administration.

Example: A community leader will use principles of community involvement, community development, public relations, and politics.

Example: A colleague will evaluate the quality, quantity and organization of the selected content according to the nature of the discipline involved.

Example: An educator will pass judgments based upon principles and practices of education.

Example: The program director and faculty measure the program's success against its stated goals and their own professional satisfaction.

Example: The funding agency will assess a continuing education project on the basis of principles of cost effectiveness and relevance to the mission of the funding agency.

Example: The trainee will pass judgement on the educational experience based on principles relative to his career development and learning relevant to problems encountered in his work.

Borrowing Expertise

How then can a program director who is rarely expert in more than one or two areas assure sound evaluation of a program?

BY UTILIZING THE EXPERTISE OF OTHERS AND INVOLVING REPRESENTATIVES FROM RELATED DISCIPLINES FIRST IN THE PLANNING, AND THEN IN THE EVALUATING PROCESS.

A program director may call upon experts on the staff or consultants from groups such as those discussed above.

In planning as in evaluating, it is particularly helpful to keep in mind the definition of evaluation as a process of gathering data for purposes of enlightened decision making.

(Specific suggestions for utilizing expertise of persons in related areas and organizations are found in final sections of the guidelines.)

use of the accompanying charts

The three charts in the following section are designed to help in developing a workable and continuous evaluation process usable from the earliest planning stages through final evaluation and writing of a report.

The charts illustrate an approach to evaluation planning. They are not intended to be detailed checklists. Not all items will apply to every program. Program directors may find it worthwhile to go over each question and make a decision as to whether it is applicable and practical to include in his evaluation process. While each question may be worth review, it is expected that for any given program only a portion will be used.

There is a separate chart on three of the four evaluation areas mentioned in the introduction: (1) Community Involvement, (2) Education, (3) Administration and Finance.

The term Community Involvement is used in a broad sense to mean not only how the program relates to other programs and organizations in the community, and how they participate in it, but how the program contributes to the solution of local, State and national mental health problems.

Each of the above evaluation areas is broken down on the following pages from three standpoints: (1) principles, (2) planning, data gathering, decision-making, (3) suggested evaluation questions. (These may be used as follow-up questions but in many instances they are also questions to which the review committees seek answers prior to making grants.)

The fourth area mentioned in the introduction—that of evaluation from the standpoint of the specialized knowledge and skills of the discipline(s) being taught—is not developed in a separate chart. Criteria unique to each specialty area are beyond the scope of these guidelines. Each program should assure relevance and soundness of specialized knowledge and utilize consultants when the expertise is not available on the faculty. Evaluation would usually be by expert judgment, standardized examinations, critical incident studies and increments in demonstrable skills acquired by trainees. Some general consideration of the quality, quantity and organization of the content is covered under Principles of Education, Chart 2-A.

CHART 1

Community Involvement

HOW DOES THE PROGRAM FIT INTO THE LARGER COMMUNITY FRAMEWORK?

A. *Principles*	B. *Planning, Data Gathering, Decision Making*	C. *Suggested Evaluation Questions*
1. A continuing education program should be an integral part of the efforts of the community, State, and Nation to solve mental health problems and consistent with the mental health plans and priorities for the specific geographic area involved. It should also be consistent with existing and potential manpower resources and include a strategy for effective utilization of limited manpower to meet high priority needs.	Review literature relating to mental health manpower and training needs. (See appendix for sources.) Study State and community mental health plan and regional health plans. Review available epidemiologic and manpower information and other surveys. Include informed citizens and professionals as sources of information for program planning. Make formal or informal survey of community attitudes and needs. Discuss program with local and regional mental health and regional health authorities.	How does the program fit into, and contribute to local, State and national mental health goals and priorities? What contribution is the proposed program expected to make toward solving high priority mental health problems? How will it foster more effective utilization of existing manpower? Spread effect? Has the preliminary investigation covered all related areas and yielded adequate information for preliminary decisions on training needs around which a program can be built? Is there adequate baseline data by which to evaluate (at least informally) the relevance and impact of the continuing education program on high priority mental health needs and manpower?
2. The continuing education program should be an integral part of, or at least compatible with, the nature of the sponsoring institution. The sponsoring organization(s) should have a history of commitment to education and to the objectives of the proposed continuing education program—or at least provide firm evidence of intent to develop such a history.	Define program's operational identity within the sponsoring organization and within the community. Read carefully any official statements as to the nature and mission of the sponsoring institution. Become informed as to the image of the organization and its purpose in the minds of its officials and of outsiders, particularly in the minds of potential participants in the continuing education program.	Is the program consistent with the goals and objectives of the sponsoring organization? Has the sponsoring institution demonstrated by past performance or current investment of resources a commitment to the objectives of the continuing education program?

3. Community agencies and consumers with interests related to the training program area should be involved in the planning and development, and where appropriate, the operation of the program.	Contact agencies with related interests, and become informed as to their resources and activities. Identify the groups and their functions to be involved in the planning. Develop relationships with community agencies which might serve as educational resources. Establish planning and evaluation and/or advisory committee, representing key agencies' students, experts in the discipline, in education, and in administration and finance. Involve related interest groups in evaluation plans.	In what ways were community agencies with related interests, and consumers of the program involved in its planning, operation, and evaluation? Does the program fit sufficiently well into current trends and values in the community that the program "has lots of things going for it" in addition to the primary sponsorship?
4. The impact of the proposed program on the power structures, mutual interests, competitive positions, economics and politics of related agencies and persons should be taken into consideration during the planning.	Analyze what problems shared by other agencies the proposed program would help to solve. Analyze whether the proposed program will pose any threats or problems for agencies, or individuals with related or over-lapping or conflicting interests.	What methods were used to explore and resolve potential conflicts of interest both within the sponsoring organization and among organizations with related interests and purposes. Are there distorted views of the program or its sponsors which handicap its success and that would be amenable to accurate information and communication?

CHART 2

Education

IS THE PROGRAM BASED ON SOUND EDUCATIONAL THEORY & PRACTICE?

A. *Principles*	B. *Planning, Data Gathering, Decision Making*	C. *Suggested Evaluation Questions*
1. Sound education: —is based on trainee, community and faculty involvement in the planning and educating processes.	NOTE: See Community Involvement Chart 1-B for steps to take to gain educational involvement.	What role is played by fellow professionals, prospective faculty members, trainees and educators in assessing training needs, defining program's purpose, developing program and evaluation plans? What provisions are made for student participation in the active educational process? If teaching resource organizations are used, do these cooperate and make significant contributions to the planning and educational process?
2. —is based on carefully selected trainees, screened to match their needs to the specific training being offered and their strategic significance for effective utilization of existing manpower.	Define target trainee population and their relevance to mental health manpower strategy for the area being served. Define both the total universe of potential trainees and the criteria for selecting actual trainees—such as their number and qualifications. Devise screening measures to select trainees and to screen out inappropriate potential trainees. Devise promotional methods to attract appropriate trainees.	Were the methods used to select a trainee group appropriate to the proposed educational program and its objectives?
3. —is based on specific educational objectives, preferably stated in behavioral terms, which reflect the needs of trainees and of the community they will serve. —is based on trainees' readiness to learn and community readiness for program. —is based on achieving a measurable outcome consistent with the educational objectives.	Sample trainee and/or community needs (felt and unfelt) and readiness by formal or informal surveys, and interviews with key leaders and potential trainees. Consider the "ripple effect"—how trainees will spread benefits of their learning to professionals and allied personnel to the benefit of the community. Define program objectives in terms of trainee and community needs and readiness, using specific behavioral criteria when possible.	What methods for assessing needs were used? Are needs clearly specified in the program plans and are objectives defined in terms of these needs? Are the educational objectives clearly defined in behavioral terms? What will be the criteria and methods for assessing whether the educational objectives have been accomplished? Does a purpose statement in the program plan clearly specify the long-range objectives based on needs of various constituencies?

4. —is based on a carefully planned program outline and timetable which permits ample time to accomplish goals, and for individual instruction as needed. —utilizes a variety of methods, materials and community resources. Methods are consistent with objectives and are appropriate to the particular trainees. —contains appropriate amounts of quality subject matter presented in keeping with the principles of the discipline(s) being taught.	Develop detailed program outline and timetable which states general objectives, objectives for specific teaching-learning experiences, and suggests materials, methods and resources to be used. Consult literature and educational experts regarding educational methodology. Provide teacher training in educational methods and materials. Use prospective faculty, colleagues, subject specialists in developing content and organization within the framework of the program objectives.	Does the plan reflect a program of adequate scope and emphasis oriented toward achieving stated objectives? Are the educational methods and materials selected for effectiveness, and do they reflect variety? Are the methods consistent with the objectives? What methods were used to assure high quality content?
5. —provides for flexibility in planning and carry-through so needed modifications may be made during the course.	Consult faculty and trainees periodically to determine if teaching-learning needs are being met. (Continuous evaluation by instructors and students.)	Can the program adapt quickly to changing needs and conditions?
6. —is designed to achieve continuous feed-back from trainees, faculty and others for the purpose of continuing and final evaluation of the program.	Develop a continuous and final evaluation plan which is an integral part of the program plan and timetable. Decide which formal and informal evaluation techniques to program into the course. Define basic data useful for evaluation which should be gathered through administrative procedures—students' background preparation, enrollment figures, attendance, preliminary enrollment questionnaire, student grades, etc.	Are findings from continuing evaluation being fed back into the program to accomplish on-going improvement? What provisions are made for formal or informal testing procedures to obtain continuous feed-back from trainees, the community, etc.? Were follow-up questionnaires or interviews employed to gain information on how trainees passed along the benefits of their training to others and how their patients or clients benefitted.?
7. —is based on an optimum number of highly qualified instructors and a ratio of students based on maximum learning in relation to time, cost and educational methods used.	Arrange for highly qualified instructors and needed support personnel. Define instructors' responsibilities clearly.	Are criteria of staff selection clear? Is the faculty adequate both in quality and quantity? Are their instructional responsibilities clearly defined? Is there provision for faculty meetings and faculty development?
8. —is based on adequate back-up administrative and other service personnel to bring faculty to maximum efficiency.	Provide for adequate administrative services to the professional staff.	Are all necessary staff services provided for? Do instructors have time to reflect on and review critically their teaching and the progress of the trainees?

CHART 3

Administration—Finance

HAVE ADEQUATE FINANCING AND ADMINISTRATION BEEN PROVIDED FOR?

A. *Principles*	B. *Planning, Data Gathering, Decision Making*	C. *Suggested Evaluation Questions*
1. Sound Administrative and Financial Management: —advances the educational aims of the program through providing services to that program.	Outline the kind of administrative structure needed. Seek management and financial guidance from experts in these areas. Consider membership of such experts on planning committee.	Are office services adequate in quantity and quality? Are inquiries and registrations handled promptly?
2. —provides adequate communications service.	Provide effective promotion and public relations service.	Is the promotion program recruiting desired clientele? Do promotion materials accurately reflect the quality and spirit of the program? Is promotion used to help bring together unperceived needs of students with their felt needs? Are promotional costs excessive for this project, possibly reflecting recruitment problems based on factors other than reasonable promotional measures?
3. —provides facilities and personnel for smooth operation of the program.	Reserve suitable meeting rooms, laboratories, and needed equipment. Develop contractual and/or financial arrangements with participating community organizations.	Are meeting rooms adequate in number, size, flexibility, comfort, and attractiveness? Are the lighting, ventilation and storage facilities adequate? Is there adequate instructional equipment? Is the space and equipment used as close to capacity as possible? Is the instructional equipment in optimal operating capacity? Are relationships with participating organizations businesslike? Are there contracts or letters of understanding defining mutual agreements? Is compensation adequate? Are there adequate eating and sleeping arrangements?
4. —operates on sound personnel management policies.	Define specific qualifications needed in the professional staff, with job descriptions. Plan any needed orientation for staff.	Is the staff fully qualified? Is compensation of professional staff competitive with other institutions? Are new instructors and leaders given adequate orientation? Is the performance of the faculty assessed?

5. —provides adequate back-up services for staff.	Provide for adequate services to support for professional staff (administrative, maintenance, clerical and service personnel.)	Do leaders and instructors receive assistance in room arrangement for maximum informality and interaction? Are physical facilities properly safeguarded, maintained in good condition?
6. —defines and plans in detail all costs for personnel, services, equipment, and facilities throughout the course of the program. —projects need at all stages of program development, and makes allowances for upcoming needs, including need for follow-up evaluation studies.	Plan budget in detail and project it step by step to cover the planning, operating and following through stages of the program. Include in budget plan all costs for competitive salaries for professional, administrative and service personnel; materials, facilities, equipment and maintenance, guest lectures, planning committee costs, etc. Salaries and fees consistent with those of comparable nature by the sponsoring organization and geographic area. Assess increasing costs arising out of increasing involvement of related groups, and make allowances for these.	Is the budget detailed, realistically planned and set up on a timetable? Have all possible expenses been considered, including planning costs, evaluation costs, etc. Have trustees, employers and other funding sources been sufficiently informed and involved to see the long-term wisdom and efficiency of continuing education of staff as an essential component for effective utilization of manpower and delivery of services?
7. --seeks to establish sound financing both for initial phases of program and for ongoing program.	Outline various sources of support and select soundest. Develop auxiliary support. Define these in the proposed budget. Employers and trainees should participate in financial support of the educational program, thus providing an indication of its value to them for fulfilling their own objectives.	Has every possible source of funding been investigated? Is the program taking advantage of more than one source of funding? Do employers and trainees contribute? Is it developing future sources for a continuing program?
8. —keeps accurate records, and gathers baseline data for use in program evaluation.	Determine basic kinds of useful data which should be gathered in the process of registration, and during the course. (attendance, student background, etc.) Plan administrative and staff time needed to gather baseline data and keep records, handle followup mailings, or compilations of data from tests, questionnaires, etc.	Are records accurate, as comprehensive as necessary, as simple as practicable, and accessible? Are routine data gathered for future evaluation?
9. —prepares cost analysis and cost effectiveness studies.	Plan way of measure cost effectiveness and cost benefit.	Have cost effectiveness (number reached and ultimate impact per dollar spent) and cost benefit (beneficial changes caused in students per dollar spent) been made? Has the consultation and assistance of experts in cost analysis been utilized?

reference list

EVALUATION AND EVALUATIVE-RESEARCH

Abrahamson, Stephen, Evaluation in Continuing Medical Education, *Journal of the American Medical Association* 206: 625, October 14, 1968.

Adler, Leta M., John E. Ware, and Allen J. Enelow, Changes in Medical Interviewing Style after Instruction With Two Closed-Circuit Television Techniques, *Journal of Medical Education* 45:21-28, January 1970.

Bergen, Bernard J., Professional Communities and the Evaluation of Demonstration Projects in Community Mental Health, *American Journal of Public Health* 55:1057-1066, July 1965.

Besco, Robert, Joseph Tiffin and Donald C. King, Evaluation Techniques for Management Development Programs, *Journal of the American Society for Training and Development* 13:13-27, October 1959.

Chernushin and Galvin, Evaluation That Is Frankly Subjective, *American Journal of Nursing* 62:92-93, February 1962.

Copp, John S., and Laurel Copp, Criteria for Case Construction, *Nursing Outlook* 2:277-279, April 1963.

Dressl, Paul L., and Lewis B. Mayhew 1954, Evaluation as an Aid to Instruction. In French, Sidney J. (ed.) *Accent on Teaching*, New York: Harper and Brothers, pp. 297-320.

Erickson, Donald L., *Analysis of AMA Continuing Education Accreditation Program Pre-Survey Questionnaire*, March 14, 1969, pp. 1-4. (mimeographed) University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois.

Erickson, Donald L., *Continuing Education Program Evaluation Self-Study Guide*. University of Illinois College of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois, May 1969.

Fivars, Grace and Doris Gosnell, *Nursing Evaluation: the Problem and the Process; the Critical Incident Technique*, New York 1966, MacMillan Co.

Gilpin, John, Design and Evaluation of Instructional Systems, *AV Communication Review*, 10:2, March, April 1962.

Hallman, Shannon P., and Timothy Havey, *An Exploratory Study of a Consultation Education Process* (an evaluation of a continuing education project for physicians) mimeographed. Raleigh, North Carolina, 1969, North Carolina Department of Mental Health.

Herzog, Elizabeth, *Some Guidelines for Evaluative Research*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau, No. 378-1959.

Hutchinson, G.B., Evaluation of Preventive Services, *Journal of Chronic Diseases*, 11:497, 1960.

Hyman, Herbert, *Survey Design and Analysis*: Glencoe, Illinois, 1955, The Free Press.

Kirkpatrick, Donald L., 1967, Evaluation of Training. In Robert L. Craig and Lester R. Bittel (eds.) *Training and Development Handbook*. New York, McGraw-Hill, pp. 87-112.

Klineberg, Otto, The Problem of Evaluation, *International Social Science* Bulletin, 7, 1955.

Knowles, Malcolm S., Evaluating Comprehensive Programs, Chapter VIII, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education N.Y., N.Y.*, 1970, Association Press.

MacMahon, Brian, et al., Principles in the Evaluation of Community Mental Health Programs, *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 51:963, July 1961.

McKeachie, W. J., Research on Teaching at the College and University Level, *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, N. L. Gage, editor, Chicago 1963, Rand McNally and Company.

Miller, George E., et al., *Teaching and Learning in Medical School*, Chap. 14, Cambridge, 1962, Howard University Press.

Parlette, Nicholas, Evaluation of Continuing Education, *American Journal of Public Health* 60:316-321, February 1970.

Parlette, Nicholas, Continuing Education in Public Health—The Experience of the Western States, 1959-66, *American Journal of Public Health* 58:3, March 1968.

Payne, David A. *The Specification and Measurement of Learning Outcome*, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1968. Blaisdell Publishing Company.

Pearson, Judson B., editor, *The Analysis of Short-Term Seminars in Psychiatry for Non-Psychiatrist Physicians: A Progress Report for the Years 1963-66.* Boulder, Colorado, 1966, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Pearson, Judson B., editor, *The Assessment of Short-Term Seminars in Psychiatry for Non-Psychiatrist Physicians: A Progress Report for the Years 1966-68*, Boulder, Colorado, 1969, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Price, Elmina M., *Learning Needs of Registered Nurses* (Nursing Education Monographs) New York, 1967, Teachers' College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Sellitiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., Cook, S., *Research Methods in Social Relations*, New York, 1960, Henry Holt and Company.

Simpson, Ray H., *Teacher Self Evaluation*, New York, 1966, The MacMillan Company.

Stake, Robert E., Toward a Technology for the Evaluation of Educational Programs, *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*, American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Curriculum Education, Chicago, 1967, Rand McNally & Company, P. 5.

Stufflebean, David L., Toward a Science of Education Evaluation, *Educational Technology*, July 30, 1968.

Suchman, Edward A., *Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs*, New York, 1967, Russell Sage Foundation.

Tarail, Mark, *A Comprehensive Community Mental Health Center from Definition to Development*. Mimeographed, 1965, Princeton, New Jersey, The Maimonides Community Mental Health Center.

Taylor, C.W., and others, *Measurement and Prediction of Nursing Performance*, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1966, University of Utah (Mimeographed).

Zabarenko, Lucy, Rex A. Pittenger, and Ralph N. Zabarenko, *Primary Medical Practice, A Psychiatric Evaluation*, St. Louis, Mo., 1968, Warren H. Green, Inc.

Annotated Bibliographies by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, National Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, Georgia and National Institute of Mental Health, Chevy Chase, Maryland. Washington, D.C., 1969, Government Printing Office.

Training Methodology—

Part I - *Background Theory & Research*
Part II - *Planning and Administration*, pp. 42-64
Part III - *Instructional Methods and Techniques*
Part IV - *Audiovisual Theory, Aids, and Equipment*

In-Service Training—

In-Service Training for Key Professionals in Community Mental Health
In-Service Training in Mental Health for Staff Residential Institutions
In-Service Training for Allied Professional and Non-Professionals in Community Mental Health

roster of participants

Meeting of Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
on Continuing Education Program Evaluation
National Institute of Mental Health
April 22-23, 1969

Dr. Allen J. Enelow
Chairman, Department of Psychiatry
Michigan State University
College of Human Medicine
East Lansing, Michigan

Mr. Shannon Hallman
Social Research Section
Division of Health Affairs
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Victor Howery
Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
Wisconsin State University
Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Dr. Allen S. Kaplan
Acting Chief—
Continuing Education Branch
Division of Physician Manpower
Bureau of Health Manpower
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. Malcolm S. Knowles
Professor of Education
School of Education
Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. Richard F. Manegold
Associate Director for Operations
& Development
Division of Regional Medical Programs
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Dr. Wilbert McKeachie
Chairman, Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mr. Roger Miller
Professor of Social Work
Smith College School of Social Work
Northampton, Massachusetts

Dr. Judson Pearson
Director of Research, WICHE Project of
Continuing Education for Physicians
Associate Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Mrs. Elda Popiel
Professor & Director of Continuing
Education, School of Nursing
University of Colorado
Denver, Colorado

Dr. Sidney Pulver
Director, Project for Continuing
Education of Physicians
Institute of the Pennsylvania Hospital
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Neal Raudabaugh
Director of Training and Research
Department of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.

Dr. Alice Scates
Bureau of Research
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare
Washington, D. C.

Mr. John E. Ware
Research Associate in Psychiatry
University of Southern California
School of Medicine
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Lucy Zabarenko
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Research
School of Education
Department of Psychiatry
School of Medicine
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dr. Franklyn N. Arnhoff,
Chief/Dr. Beatrice Shriver
Manpower and Analytic Studies Branch
Division of Manpower and Training
National Institute of Mental Health

CONTINUING EDUCATION BRANCH STAFF

Dr. Thomas G. Webster
Chief

Mr. Warren C. Lamson
Assistant Chief

Miss Margaret E. Hoffman
Chief, Social Services & Correctional
Personnel Section

Mrs. Jeanette Nehren
Chief, Nursing and Related Therapeutic
Personnel Section

Dr. Peter Putnam
Training Specialist
Psychiatry and Public Health

Dr. Carolyn Robinowitz
Training Specialist, Psychiatry

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1971—O-438-345

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 25 cents
Stock Number 1724-0167

16

acknowledgements

This initial edition of the *Guidelines for Evaluation of Continuing Education Programs in Mental Health* was written primarily by Mrs. Norma Miller, of the National Institute of Mental Health, Office of Communications, in collaboration with the undersigned. The contents are based on the background materials and discussions of an ad hoc Advisory Committee on Continuing Education Program Evaluation sponsored by the NIMH Continuing Education Branch. A roster of the Committee members appears on page 16.

Staff of the Continuing Education Branch who were significant contributors to the background materials for the Advisory committee meeting, to the committee discussions and as editorial collaborators for these Guidelines include Peter Putnam, Jeanette Nehren, Warren Lamson, Margaret Hoffman and Carolyn Rabinowitz. Dr. Putnam and Mrs. Nehren were especially instrumental in preparations for the meeting and the Guidelines.

Significant stimuli for and participation in this and other projects relevant to evaluation have come from the Continuing Education Training Review Committee, particularly Dr. Wilbert McKeachie, Chairman in 1969-70. Other committee contributors to this particular project included Allen J. Enelow, Victor Howery and Malcolm Knowles.

We are also indebted to NIMH secretaries Ruby Kaster, Georgia Lund, Richard Loebl and Thelma Leventhal.

Thomas G. Webster, M.D.

ERIC Clearinghouse
OCT 13 1972
on Adult Education

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH
5600 FISHERS LANE
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20852

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, $300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF H.E.W.

U.S.MAIL

DHEW PUBLICATION NO. (HSM–72–9014)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Public Health Service
Health Services and Mental Health Administration